

Application No.: 09/870226

Case No.: 54538US012

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 and 35-37 are pending. Claims 22-34 have been canceled. Claim 10 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 7 to claim 1. No new claims have been added.

**The Interview Summary**

The interview was held on June 2, 2005. Those who participated in the interview were Examiner Donald Loney, Dr. Ken L. Smith (a named inventor) and Mr. James V. Lilly. Applicants' response mailed on May 6, 2005, all of the claims; all of the references; and all of the rejections were discussed. No agreement was reached with regard to the allowability of any claims.

In addition to the comments made by the Applicants during the interview, Applicants wish to add the following additional remarks with regard to the rejection of claims 1-21 and 35-37 over Rowland (US 3,810,804) or Rowland (US 5,376,431), collectively Rowland, in view of Stamm (US 3,712,706).

Rowland discloses an article in which the adhesive is applied to a surface that is not retroreflective. As a result, Rowland does not provide any reason to replace its non-retroreflective back surface with a retroreflective surface.

Rowland also fails to describe or suggest that the adhesive is transparent. In fact, Rowland does not suggest the use of such an adhesive as he fails to recognize that there is any benefit or need to use such an adhesive because the light in the structures of Rowland never passes through the adhesive.

Rowland and Stamm all fail to disclose the use of a radiation curable resin. In fact, these references are silent with regard to how the resin is solidified. Thus, they neither teach nor suggest that any particular method of solidifying the resin is better than any other method. Consequently, they cannot suggest that a radiation curable resin should be used.

As a result, the combination of Rowland with Stamm does not render any of the claims unpatentable under 35 USC § 103(a) for this additional reason.

Application No.: 09/870226

Case No.: 54538US012

In view of the preceding discussion, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

June 3, 2005  
Date

By: James V. Lilly  
James V. Lilly, Reg. No.: 27,817  
Telephone No.: (651) 733-1543

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833